

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,646	07/12/2001	Paul D. Crutcher	42390P10469	3379
8791	7590	08/26/2004	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN				STRANGE, AARON N
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD				
SEVENTH FLOOR				
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030				
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2153

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,646	CRUTCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron Strange	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 40 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claim is identical to claim 18. It appears that Applicant intended for the claim to depend from claim 26 rather than claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 6 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for HTTP, does not reasonably provide enablement for the use of HTML or XML as the "tag based protocol". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. While the specification provides support for the use of HTTP headers in several locations, no mention is made of writing proxy headers according to using HTML or XML.

4. Claims 11,12,36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification fails to provide support for determining loads for the multiple resource managers or selecting among the multiple resource managers according to the loads. Parallel operations are disclosed in Page 10, Lines 11-13, but no mention is made of determining loads or selecting among resource managers based on the determined load.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 5,6,30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. With regard to claims 5 and 30, the limitation "wherein proxy headers" renders the scope of the claim unclear. It is unclear if the proxy headers being referred to are the proxy headers claimed in claim 3 or additional proxy headers.

8. With further regard to claims 5 and 30, the term "tag based protocol" is unclear. The term is not defined by the claim or in the specification, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

9. With regard to claims 6 and 31, HTML and XML are markup languages, not "tag based protocols". It is unclear what Applicant intends claim 6 to mean with regard to these limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-6,13-16,18-26,28-31, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape in view of Goldberg et al.

12. The Office would like to ~~not~~^{note} that the Netscape reference, while contained in a plurality of different files, has been treated as a single reference in this Office action. The files were all retrieved from Netscape's website, and were all updated on the same date. They are chapters from the Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide, and the entire guide is available online at the following address:

<http://developer.netscape.com/docs/manuals/proxy/adminux/>

Only the relevant chapters have been included with this Office action.

13. With regard to claims 1,20, and 26, Netscape discloses a method for a proxy to transparently provide access to resources of a resource manager, comprising: receiving from the client a resource locator (URL) for retrieving a resource of the resource manager, wherein the resource locator comprises a network address of the resource manager (Chapter 7, Page 1, Lines 12-13); validating client authorization to access the resource (Chapter 7, Page 3, Lines 9-11); retrieving the resource from the resource manager according to the resource locator (Chapter 7, Page 1, Lines 16-19); and

providing the resource to the client such that it appears to have originated from the proxy (Chapter 7, Page 1, Lines 14-15). Netscape fails to disclose that the resource locator is at least partially obscured to hide the network address or de-obscuring the resource locator.

Goldberg et al. (Goldberg, hereafter) teaches a method of obscuring and de-obscuring a resource locator to disguise the actual location of the resource manager from the client. The obscured URL directs the client to the proxy, which de-obscures it and retrieves the resource on behalf of the client (Page 6, Col 2, Line 24 to Page 7, Col 1, Line 5). This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Netscape since it allows increased security by hiding the actual location of the resource manager from the client. A further advantage is the ability for documents to be published anonymously through the proxy, since the actual location of the document is obscured from the client.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to partially obscure the resource locator to hide the actual location of the resource manager, and de-obscure the resource locator at the proxy to enable retrieval of the resource for the client. This provides increased network security since the resource locator available to the public is very difficult to associate with an actual server, making it difficult to attack the server or determine the origin of anonymously published documents.

14. With regard to claims 3,21, and 28, Netscape further discloses receiving a first proxy header corresponding to the request, the first proxy header identifying the client

as the source of the request and the proxy as the source of the resource; and preparing a second proxy header by rewriting the first proxy header so as to substitute the proxy for the client, and the resource manager for the proxy; wherein retrieving the resource from the resource manager comprises providing the second proxy header to the resource manager (Chapter 7, Page 1, Line 11 to Page 2, Line 2). Since the firewall only allows access to the content server by the proxy on a specific port, the header must be rewritten so the firewall thinks the request originates from the proxy.

15. With regard to claims 4,22, and 29, Netscape further discloses receiving a third proxy header from the resource manager, the third proxy header identifying the resource manager as the source of the resource, and the proxy as the recipient of the resource; and preparing a fourth proxy header by rewriting the third proxy header so as to substitute the proxy as the source of the resource, and the client as the recipient of the resource; wherein providing the resource to the client comprises providing the fourth proxy header to the client (The proxy sends the response to the client, as if it were the actual content sever) (Chapter 7, Page 1, Lines 18-22).

16. With regard to claims 5 and 30, Netscape further discloses that the proxy headers are written according to a tag based protocol (Requests for URLs are HTTP) (Chapter 7, Page 5, Lines 1-8).

17. With regard to claims 6 and 31, Netscape further discloses that the tag based protocol is a selected one of: the HyperText Transport Protocol (HTTP), the HyperText Markup Language (HTML), and the extensible Markup Language (XML) (Requests for URLs are HTTP) (Chapter 7, Page 5, Lines 1-8).

18. With regard to claims 13,23, and 38 Goldberg further discloses that the resource locator comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL); and inspecting the URL for a path component (the ! character) indicating the URL comprises the at least partially obscured portion (Page 6, Col 2, Line 37 to Page 7, Col 1, Line 3).

19. With regard to claim 14, Goldberg further discloses that de-obscuring the resource locator comprises providing at least the obscured portion of the resource locator to a location manager and receiving a de-obscured identifier responsive thereto (Obscured portion is decrypted) (Page 6, Col 2, Line 37 to Page 7, Col 1, Line 3).

20. With regard to claim 15, Netscape further discloses that the location manager performs the validating client authorization to access the resource (Chap 14, Page 3, Lines 9-11).

21. With regard to claim 16, Netscape further discloses that validating client authorization to access the resource comprises providing at least the partially obscured portion of the resource locator (URL), and an identity identifier for the client to an authorization manager (Resources are restricted or allowed based on user identification) (Chap 5, Page 4, Lines 40-47).

22. With regard to claims 17,24, and 39, Netscape further discloses hash-encoding an identity value associated with the client (creation of SSL certificate); and providing the hash-encoded identity value (SSL certificate) and at least a portion of the resource locator (URL) to an authorization manager configured to look up the hash-encoded identity value and the at least a portion of the resource locator in an access control

table. (Resources are restricted or allowed based on user identification) (Chap 5, Page 4, Lines 40-47).

23. With regard to claims 18,25, and 40, Netscape further discloses that the client communicates with the proxy by way of an Internet browser (Netscape Navigator) (Chap 14, Page 2, Lines 22-24).

24. With regard to claims 2 and 19, while the system disclosed by Netscape in view of Goldberg shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed with regard to claim 3), it fails to specifically disclose that the proxy comprises a front end manager and a back end manager, wherein the client only communicates with the front end manager for obtaining the resource, and wherein the back end manager obtains the resource from the resource manager.

However, since the proxy server acts as a front-end to the content server and all communications between the client and the content server go through the proxy without knowledge of each other's existence; a front-end manager and a back-end manager must be present. The proxy has two separate interfaces, each of which requires a separate IP address. A front-end manager must be present to handle communications with the client through the front-end interface and a back-end manager must be present to handle communications with the back-end server through the back-end interface.

25. Claims 7,8,32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape in view of Goldberg et al. in further view of Sasaki (US 2001/0013070).

26. With regard to claims 7,8,32, and 33, while the system disclosed by Netscape in view of Goldberg shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the first proxy header comprises a content type identifier identifying a desired format for the resource, and wherein the resource manager stores the resource in a second format different from the desired format, the method further comprising: converting the resource from the second format to the first format.

Sasaki teaches the use of content identifiers in a proxy header (Page 3, Par 53) as a means to inform the proxy of the desired format for the resource. If the resource retrieved by the proxy from the content server is in a different format, it is converted prior to being sent to the client (Pages 3-4, Par 53-57). This is an advantageous feature because it allows clients to specify content restrictions and preferences and the proxy server will convert the retrieved content appropriately.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the client to specify formatting information for requested content and have the proxy server convert the retrieved content so that it is in an acceptable format for the client. This allows clients with limited display capabilities, such as PDA, to access a traditional web site by having the proxy server convert the site into an acceptable format for display on the PDA.

27. Claims 9,10,12,34,35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape in view of Goldberg in further view of Rodriguez et al.

28. With regard to claim 9, while the system disclosed by Netscape in view of Goldberg shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the network comprises multiple resource managers providing access to the resource, the method further comprising: retrieving portions of the resource from selected ones of the multiple resource managers.

Rodriguez et al. (Rodriguez, hereafter) teaches the use of multiple resource managers mirroring the same resources and retrieving portions of a requested resource from a plurality of the resource managers simultaneously. The file is partitioned into blocks, and each block is requested from a different resource manager (Page 1, Col 2, Line 34 to Page 1, Col 1, Line 3). This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Netscape in view of Goldberg since it can dramatically decrease the time it takes for the client to receive a file.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use multiple resource managers to host the resources and retrieve a portion of the resource from each resource manager. This would have dramatically decreased the time it took for the client to receive a requested resource.

29. With regard to claim 10, Rodriguez further discloses that the portions are retrieved in parallel from the selected ones of the multiple resource managers (Page 1, Col 2, Line 34).

30. With regard to claim 12, Rodriguez further discloses that the portions are non-overlapping portions of the resource (Each block is a different part of the file) (Page 1, Col 2, Line 34).

Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 703-305-8878. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS 8/20/2004



GLEN D. BURGESS
SUPPLY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100